arXiv:1702.05066v1 [math.ST] 16 Feb 2017

Maximum Number of Modes of Gaussian Mixtures

Carlos Améndola, Alexander Engström, and Christian Haase

February 16, 2017

Abstract

Gaussian mixture models are widely used in Statistics. A fundamental aspect of these distributions is the study of the local maxima of the density, or modes. In particular, the number of modes that can arise in a mixture of k Gaussians in d dimensions remains unknown in the general case. We give a brief account of this problem's history and expand on known results in this direction. In particular, we give improved lower bounds and the first upper bound on the maximum number of non-degenerate modes.

1 Introduction

The d-dimensional Gaussian distribution $N(\mu, \Sigma)$ can be defined by its probability density function

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det(2\pi\Sigma)}} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{2}(x-\mu)^T \Sigma^{-1}(x-\mu)}. \tag{1}$$

where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the mean vector and the symmetric positive definite $d \times d$ matrix Σ is the covariance matrix. This density has a unique absolute maximum at $x = \mu$. Now, we consider a mixture distribution X consisting of k Gaussian components $X_i \sim N(\mu_i, \Sigma_i)$ and mixture weights α_i for $i = 1, \ldots, k$, so that:

$$f_X(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i f_{X_i}(x). \tag{2}$$

This is again a probability density function given that $\alpha_i \geq 0$ and $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_k = 1$. In other words, the density for a Gaussian mixture is a convex combination of Gaussian densities. Such mixtures can exhibit quite complex behavior even for a small number k of components. This is a feature that makes it attractive for modeling in applications.

We will be interested in the maximal number $m(d, k)$ of local maxima for d-dimensional Gaussian mixtures with k components. This is a property of a Gaussian mixture density with fixed parameters and no sample involved; it should not be confused with the number of local maxima of the likelihood function of a Gaussian mixture model (a relevant but different question, see [2] and [9]).



Figure 1: Mixture of two univariate Gaussians with 2 modes

2 Background

As stated in the introduction, a single Gaussian has a unique mode, that is, $m(d, 1) = 1$ for all $d \geq 1$. The simplest case when there is actually a mixture has $d = 1$ and $k = 2$: a mixture of two univariate Gaussians $X_1 \sim N(\mu_1, \sigma_1)$ and $X_2 \sim N(\mu_2, \sigma_2)$, with mixture parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. It was observed historically that in this scenario the number of modes was either 1 or 2, with the following heuristics:

- If the distance between the modes is small, then the mixture is unimodal (independently of α).
- If the distance between the modes is large enough, then there is bimodality unless α is close to 0 or 1.

A.C. Cohen (1953) and Eisenberger (1964) obtained some first explicit conditions in these directions [3]. Notably, if $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \sigma$, then the mixture is unimodal (with mode at $\frac{\mu_1+\mu_2}{2}$) if and only if $|\mu_2 - \mu_1| \leq 2\sigma$. A few years later, J. Behboodian gives a proof that indeed $m(1, 2) = 2$ by bounding the number of critical points of the density, and finds that

$$|\mu_2 - \mu_1| \leq 2 \min(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$$

is a sufficient condition for unimodality. Furthermore, if $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \sigma$, then

$$|\mu_2 - \mu_1| \leq 2\sigma \sqrt{1 + \frac{|\log(\alpha) - \log(1 - \alpha)|}{2}}$$



Figure 2: Sample from a mixture of two bivariate Gaussians

is again a sufficient condition for having only one mode in the mixture. Starting the 21st century, it was Carreira-Perpiñán and Williams who had particular interest in the problem [5]. Using scale-space theory, they prove that $m(1,k) = k$; any univariate Gaussian mixture with k components has a most k modes. A natural conjecture is that $m(d,k) = k$ for all d, k.[1] However, this fails already when $d = k = 2$, since a mixture of two bivariate Gaussians can have 3 distinct modes (and actually, $m(2,2) = 3$).

Example 1. *Consider* $X_1 \sim N\left(\begin{pmatrix}1\\0\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}1 & 0\\0 & 0.1\end{pmatrix}\right)$ *and* $X_2 \sim N\left(\begin{pmatrix}0\\1\end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix}0.1 & 0\\0 & 1\end{pmatrix}\right)$*, with* $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$*. There are two modes close to the original means at* $(1,0)$ *and* $(0,1)$ *but there is also a third mode near the origin. This situation is illustrated in Figure 2, with the two means marked in blue and the three modes marked in red.*

[1] In June 2016, a discussion thread on the `ANZstat` mailing list (e-mail bulletin board for statistics in Australia and New Zealand) with the title "*an interesting counter-intuitive fact*" referred to the fact that a Gaussian mixture can have more modes than components.

Special attention can be paid to assumptions on the variances. A mixture is said to be *homoscedastic* if all the variances in the components are equal: $\Sigma_i = \Sigma$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. On the other hand, a mixture is said to be *isotropic* if $\Sigma_i = \sigma_i I$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$, so that covariances are scalar matrices and the densities have a 'spherical' shape. Note that, up to coordinate change, homoscedastic mixtures are (homoscedastic) isotropic. Carreira and Williams conjectured in [5] that if one is restricted to homoscedastic Gaussian mixtures, then the maximum number of modes is actually k, and verified this numerically for many examples in a brute force search. Denoting by $h(d, k)$ this maximum number, they asserted that $h(d, k) = k$ for any $d, k \geq 1$.

Remark 2. *$h(d, k) \leq m(d, k)$ for all d, k* , and $h(d, k)$ is also the maximum number of possible modes of a Gaussian mixture with all unit covariances (by the note above and the fact that the number of modes remains invariant under affine transformations)

However, later J.J. Duistermaat emailed them [6] with a counterexample in $d = 2$ with $k = 3$ isotropic components, each on the vertex of an equilateral triangle. This configuration gives 4 modes for a small window of parameters, disproving the conjecture.

Example 3. *Consider the isotropic mixture with components $X_1 \sim N((1, 0), \sigma I_2)$, $X_2 \sim N((-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}), \sigma I_2)$ and $X_3 \sim N((-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}), \sigma I_2)$ with $\sigma = 0.72$ and $\alpha = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$. There are three modes close to the original means and there is also a fourth mode at the origin. This situation is illustrated in Figure 3, with the three means marked in blue and the four modes marked in red.*

In terms of contribution to the study of the topography of Gaussian mixture densities, S. Ray and B. Lindsay initiate a systematic study and ask interesting questions in [11]. They consider the *ridgeline function* $x^* : \Delta_k \to \mathbb{R}^d$ given by

$$x^*(\alpha) = [\alpha_1 \Sigma_1^{-1} + \alpha_2 \Sigma_2^{-1} + \ldots + \alpha_k \Sigma_k^{-1}]^{-1} [\alpha_1 \Sigma_1^{-1} \mu_1 + \alpha_2 \Sigma_2^{-1} \mu_2 + \ldots + \alpha_k \Sigma_k^{-1} \mu_k] \qquad (3)$$

and obtaining as its image the $(k-1)$-dimensional *ridgeline manifold* $\mathcal{M} = \mathrm{Im}(x^*)$ that contains all critical points of f_X. This fact is useful, for example, in the case of homoscedastic mixtures, whose critical points (and in particular all modes) lie in the convex hull of the component means (a result that appeared first in [5]). In the conclusion of [11], the following line appears: "*one might ask if there exists an upper bound for the number of modes, one that can be described as a function of k and d*". We answer this question in the affirmative for non-degenerate modes in Section 5 below.

3 Examples and Conjecture

The appearance of a possible extra mode in dimension $d = 2$ when having $k = 2$ components carries over to higher dimensions. In [12], it was proven that $m(d, 2) = d + 1$. That is, one can get as many as $d + 1$ modes from just a two component Gaussian mixture in dimension d. Looking for further progress, Ray proposed the maximum number of modes problem for the 2011 AIM Workshop on Singular Learning Theory, organized by Steele, Sturmfels and Watanabe [14]. The problem was discussed yielding the following conjecture:



Figure 3: Duistermaat's counterexample: 4 modes for mixture of 3 bivariate Gaussians

Conjecture 4. *(Sturmfels, AIM 2011) For all $d, k \geq 1$,*

$$m(d,k) = \binom{d+k-1}{d}. \tag{4}$$

This conjecture matches correctly all the known values for $m(d,k)$ that we have presented so far. In the next section we will show that for $d = 2$ there exist Gaussian mixtures that achieve as many as $\binom{k+1}{2}$ modes, showing that (4) is a lower bound on $m(2,k)$. One could ask if there exists a counterexample to Conjecture 4 similar to Duistermaat's for an isotropic mixture. Specifically, let $d = 2$ and $k = 3$, where we locate the $\binom{2+3-1}{2} = 6$ modes coming from the deformation of 3 lines arranged in a equilateral triangle and means as the middle points on the 3 sides. Each of the other 3 means lie near the corresponding triangle vertices. Could an extra mode be formed at the origin for some values of the parameters? This would give a total of 7 modes (see Figure 4). Note that by rotational symmetry, the origin is a critical point. If the Gaussians are very concentrated on the lines (see Figure 5), then everything points at the origin being a local minimum, but if they diffuse enough, then it



Figure 4: Possible 7 modes for mixture of 3 bivariate Gaussians?

becomes a mode (the problem is that we lose the other modes at the vertices). We argue that an intermediate scenario of a total of 7 modes is actually impossible. Indeed, consider any height of the equilateral triangle. Restricting the Gaussian mixture density to that line, the components corresponding to the opposite sides project to the same kernel; thus obtaining a combination of two Gaussian kernels. Since we know that the number of modes is at most two in this case, not all three of the critical points lying on the line can be modes. In [7], a construction of a finite configuration of isotropic Gaussians with many modes is presented. One considers products of triangles, using the counterexample with 4 modes of Section 2 as the basic building block to obtain 4^n modes in dimension $d = 2n$ with $k = 3^n$ components. This gives an example where the number of modes is superlinear $k^{1.261}$ in the number of components (however, note that the dimension $d = 2\log_3 k$ also grows with k).

In the following section, we provide configurations for any choice of d and k having $\binom{k}{d}+k$ modes. If we let d grow logarithmically with k as in [7], we obtain superpolynomially (but subexponentially) many modes.



Figure 5: 4 modes for mixture of 3 bivariate Gaussians

4 Many Modes

In this section, we prove that Gaussian mixtures can have many modes.

Theorem 5. *Given $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a mixture of k Gaussians in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with at least $\binom{k}{d} + k$ modes.*

For $d = 2$, this agrees with (4). Starting from a generic arrangement of k hyperplanes in $\mathbb{R}^d$, we are going to define a family $\Phi = \Phi^\delta$ of Gaußian mixtures depending on a parameter $\delta > 0$. Around each of the $\binom{k}{d}$ intersection vertices p of the arrangement, we construct neighborhoods $Q = Q(p)$, also depending on δ, so that for δ small enough, we have $\Phi^\delta|_{\partial Q} < \Phi^\delta(p)$. This certifies the existence of a mode in Q. In addition, there will be a mode near each of the k means. Consider a generic arrangement $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ of k hyperplanes in $\mathbb{R}^d$. For each $i = 1, \ldots, k$, denote by $\pi_i \colon \mathbb{R}^d \to H_i$ the orthogonal projection, and pick an affine map $\eta_i \colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $|\eta_i(x)|$ is the distance from x to H_i. Further, choose means $\mu_i \in H_i$ outside the other H_j. Then, our ith component will be a standard Gaußian with mean μ_i

along H_i with variance δ^3 in the direction normal to H_i.

$$\Phi_i(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d\ \delta^3}}\ \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\,\delta^3}\,|\eta_i(x)|^2\ -\frac{1}{2}\,\|\pi_i(x)-\mu_i\|^2\right) \tag{5}$$

For the mixture, we take all coefficients to be equal: $\Phi = \frac{1}{k}\sum_i \Phi_i$. Let p be one of the intersection vertices; without loss of generality, $\{p\} = H_1 \cap \cdots \cap H_d$. For $\delta > 0$, we define the neighborhood Q of p to be

$$Q(p) = \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \middle| |\eta_i(x)| \le \delta,\ \forall 1 \le i \le d\right\}$$

(note that $\eta_i(p) = 0$). This is an affine cube with center p. Now we consider each of its $2d$ facets $F_i^{\pm}$, $1 \le i \le d$, where

$$F_i^{\pm} = \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \middle| \eta_i(x) = \pm\delta,\ |\eta_j(x)| \le \delta\ \ \forall j \ne i\right\}.$$

Along $F_i^{\pm}$, we have that

$$\Phi_i(x) \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d\ \delta^3}}\ \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\,\delta^3}\,\delta^2\ \right) \quad \xrightarrow{\delta\to 0} \quad 0.$$

At p, we have $\eta_i(p) = 0$. We have seen that, around the point p, as $\delta \to 0$,

$$\sqrt{\delta^3}\ \max_{x\in F_j^{\pm}} \Phi_i(x) \quad \to \quad \phi_i \quad \text{for } i,j = 1,\ldots,d,\ j \ne i \tag{6}$$

$$\sqrt{\delta^3}\ \max_{x\in F_i^{\pm}} \Phi_i(x) \quad \to \quad 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1,\ldots,d \tag{7}$$

$$\sqrt{\delta^3}\ \max_{x\in Q} \Phi_i(x) \quad \to \quad 0 \quad \text{for } i = d+1,\ldots,k \tag{8}$$

where ϕ_i is the positive number

$$\phi_i := \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d}}\ \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\,\|p-\mu_i\|^2\right).$$

Adding up we get for $\Phi = \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^k \Phi_i$ that

$$\sqrt{\delta^3}\ \max_{x\in\partial Q} \Phi(x) \quad \to \quad \frac{1}{k}\sum_{\substack{i=1\\ i\ne j}}^{k} \phi_i \tag{9}$$

$$\sqrt{\delta^3}\ \Phi(p) \quad \to \quad \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} \phi_i \tag{10}$$

where $j = \text{argmin}\phi_i$. As the limit (9) is smaller (by $\phi_j > 0$) than the limit (10), there must be some $\delta^\star(p) > 0$ so that for $0 < \delta < \delta^\star(p)$ we have $\max_{x\in\partial Q}\Phi(x) < \Phi(p)$. Then the point p' where the continuous function Φ takes it maximum over the compact set Q will be in the

interior of Q, and hence is a local maximum. Choosing $\delta^\star$ to be the minimum over the $\delta^\star(p)$ over all intersection vertices p, we obtain a mixture with at least $\binom{k}{d}$ modes.

The argument for the existence of a mode near μ_i is similar, but much simpler. Fix a compact neighborhood Q of μ_i which avoids the hyperplanes H_j for $j \neq i$. For small δ, the Φ_j for $j \neq i$ are negligible along Q. So the value of the mixture Φ at μ_i will be bigger than the values along ∂Q, because this is true for Φ_i. □

5 Not Too Many Modes

Now we present an upper bound using Khovanskii's theory on Fewnomials, see [10]. Explicitly,

Theorem 6. *For all $d, k \geq 1$, the number of non-degenerate critical points for the density of a mixture of k Gaussians in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is bounded by*

$$2^{d+\binom{k}{2}}(5+3d)^k. \tag{11}$$

This will follow from a Khovanskii-type theorem that bounds the number of nondegenerate solutions to a system of polynomial equations that includes transcendental functions. Such a version where the transcendental functions are exponentials of linear forms was first presented by Khovanskii to illustrate his theory of fewnomials [[10], p.12]. In our case, however, we will be interested in exponentials of quadratic forms.

Theorem 7. *For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $F_i \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_k]$ be polynomials of degree d_i and for $1 \leq j \leq k$ consider the exponential quadratic forms $y_j(x) = \mathrm{e}^{(x-\mu_j)^T Q_j (x-\mu_j)}$, with $\mu_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $Q_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$. If $g_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ are given by $g_i(x) = F_i(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1(x), \ldots, y_k(x))$ then the number of non-degenerate solutions to the system $g_1 = g_2 = \cdots = g_n = 0$ is finite and bounded by*

$$d_1 \cdots d_n (5 + n + d_1 + \ldots + d_n)^k \cdot 2^{\frac{k(k-1)}{2}}. \tag{12}$$

In order to prove the theorem, Khovanskii gives first a sketch making simplifying assumptions (and skipping technical details) and fills the theory in his next two chapters. This sketch is also presented in [13] and [4], and we will present the proof of our theorem in the same way. We will need the following lemma (for a proof see e.g. Theorem 4.3 in [13]).

Lemma 8 (Khovanskii-Rolle)**.** *Let $C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a smooth curve that intersects $H := x_{n+1} = 0$ transversally, and $v = (v_1, \ldots, v_{n+1}) : C \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ a smooth nonvanishing tangential vector field to C. Then $|(C \cap H)| < N + q$, where N is the number of points of C where $v_{n+1} = 0$ and q is the number of unbounded components of C.*

Proof. (of Theorem 7) By Induction on k. If $k = 0$, there are no exponentials and the bound (12) reduces to the product of the degrees $d_1 \cdots d_n$. This is the well known Bézout bound for a multivariate system of polynomial equations.
Now we will give the sketch of the proof and mention how our estimates change if the assumptions in the induction step do not hold. In any case, the final inequalities needed to

prove the bound (12) will hold.
For $k \geq 1$, to reduce the number of exponentials to $k-1$, we introduce a new variable t such that the system with equations

$$\widehat{g_i}(x,t) = F_i(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1(x), \ldots, y_{k-1}(x), ty_k(x)) \tag{13}$$

will have as solutions the ones from the original system when intersecting with the hyperplane $t = 1$. We assume the system (13) defines a smooth curve C in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ (this is the critical step that needs to be modified later), so that we can apply the Khovanskii-Rolle Lemma. Indeed, a tangential vector field to C is

$$v_r = (-1)^{n+1-r} \det \frac{\partial(\widehat{g_1}, \ldots \widehat{g_n})}{\partial(x_1, \ldots, \hat{x_i}, \ldots, x_n, t)}. \tag{14}$$

Thus, the bound for N is the number of solutions to the system in the $n+1$ variables $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n, u$ with $u = ty_k(x)$ and $k-1$ exponentials

$$\widehat{g_1} = 0, \ldots, \widehat{g_n} = 0, v_{n+1} = 0. \tag{15}$$

Now, each $\frac{\partial y_j}{\partial x_i}(x) = y_j \cdot l_{ij}(x)$ where l_{ij} is a linear function. Hence, $\frac{\partial \widehat{g_i}}{\partial x_j} = h_{ij}(x, y_1(x), \ldots, y_{k-1}(x), u)$ where h_{ij} is a polynomial of degree at most d_i+1. Thus $v_{n+1}(x,u)$ is a polynomial of degree at most $(d_1+1)+\ldots+(d_n+1) = n+D$, where $D = d_1+\ldots+d_n$. By induction hypothesis,

$$N \leq d_1 \cdots d_n (n+D)(5+(n+1)+(D+n+D))^{k-1} \cdot 2^{\frac{(k-1)(k-2)}{2}} \tag{16}$$

In order to bound q, the number of unbounded components of C, one observes that since each component has two infinite branches, there are (counted with multiplicity) $2q$ accumulation points on the sphere S^n, so a hyperplane sufficiently far from the origin will meet C in at least q points. In other words, a hyperplane can be chosen so that q can be bounded by the number of solutions of a system

$$\widehat{g_1} = 0, \ldots, \widehat{g_n} = 0, \lambda_1 x_1 + \ldots + \lambda_n x_n + \lambda_{n+1} u + \mu = 0. \tag{17}$$

for some $\lambda_i, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$. Under non-degeneracy of the solutions, we get by induction hypothesis,

$$q \leq d_1 \cdots d_n \cdot 1 \cdot (5+(n+1)+(D+1))^{k-1} \cdot 2^{\frac{(k-1)(k-2)}{2}} \tag{18}$$

So, in total,

$$\begin{aligned} N+q &\leq d_1 \cdots d_n \left[(n+D)(6+2n+2D)^{k-1} + (7+n+D)^{k-1}\right] \cdot 2^{\frac{(k-1)(k-2)}{2}} \\ &< d_1 \cdots d_n \left[(n+D)(5+n+D)^{k-1} \cdot 2^{k-1} + 5(5+n+D)^{k-1} \cdot 2^{k-1}\right] \cdot 2^{\frac{(k-1)(k-2)}{2}} \\ &= d_1 \cdots d_n (5+n+D)^k \cdot 2^{\frac{k(k-1)}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

as we wanted. This is the end of the sketch.

If the smoothness assumptions for the system after introducing t are not satisfied, the argument is modified via the Morse-Sard Theorem. The details of such modifications can be found along [10], although we find that for our theorem these are better summarized in [[4], p. 293-295]. Essentially, one slightly perturbs the system from $\hat{g}_i = 0$ to $\hat{g}_i = \epsilon_i$ (ϵ in a neighborhood of 0) to guarantee obtaining a smooth curve C. The asserted bound (12) remains unchanged, and the number of non-degenerate solutions of the perturbed system cannot be less than the number for the original system.

Another change is that since the polynomial system might not define a proper map, one adds an extra variable x_0 with an extra equation

$$g_0(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n) = x_0^2 + x_1^2 + \ldots + x_n^2 - R^2 = 0 \tag{19}$$

with $R > 0$ so that every preimage is now bounded. Morse-Sard now applies to conclude the set of regular values of $g = (g_0, \ldots, g_n) : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is open and dense. The number of non-degenerate solutions of the new system has twice the number of non-degenerate solutions of the original system that lie in the open ball of radius R centered at the origin . In terms of the bounding of the corresponding N', q', we now have

$$N' \leq 2 \cdot d_1 \cdots d_n \cdot (n + 1 + D)(5 + (n + 2) + (2 + D + n + 1 + D))^{k-1} \cdot 2^{\frac{(k-1)(k-2)}{2}} \tag{20}$$

(the extra 2 comes from the degree of 19, and we now have $n + 2$ variables). For q',

$$q' \leq 2 \cdot d_1 \cdots d_n \cdot 1 \cdot (5 + (n + 2) + 2 + D + 1)^{k-1} \cdot 2^{\frac{(k-1)(k-2)}{2}} \tag{21}$$

(the extra 1 from the hyperplane equation). Since the $R > 0$ does not affect the bound computation, it can be taken large enough to include all the solutions to the original system. Thus $N' + q'$ is a bound for twice as many non-degenerate solutions of said original system. Finally, this way the induction step inequality can again be completed

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{N' + q'}{2} &\leq d_1 \cdots d_n \left[(1 + n + D)(10 + 2n + 2D)^{k-1} + (10 + n + D)^{k-1}\right] \cdot 2^{\frac{(k-1)(k-2)}{2}} \\ &< d_1 \cdots d_n \left[(1 + n + D)(5 + n + D)^{k-1} \cdot 2^{k-1} + 4(5 + n + D)^{k-1} \cdot 2^{k-1}\right] \cdot 2^{\frac{(k-1)(k-2)}{2}} \\ &= d_1 \cdots d_n (5 + n + D)^k \cdot 2^{\frac{k(k-1)}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

as needed. □

Now we can obtain Theorem 6 as a corollary of the above.

Proof. (of Theorem 6) Let $f_X(x) = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i f_{X_i}(x)$ be a Gaussian mixture and consider the system $g_i(x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ given by the partial derivatives $g_i = \frac{\partial f_X}{\partial x_i}$. These can be interpreted as polynomials $F_i(x_1, \ldots, x_d, y_1, \ldots, y_k)$ by taking y_i as the exponential kernel of f_{X_i}. The system now has the form as in Theorem 7, and note that the degree of each F_i is 2. The number of non-degenerate critical points of f_X is thus the number of non-degenerate solutions to the system of g_i, and according to (12), it is bounded by

$$2 \cdots 2\,(5 + d + 2 + \ldots + 2)^k \cdot 2^{\frac{k(k-1)}{2}} = 2^d (5 + d + 2d)^k\, 2^{\binom{k}{2}} = 2^{d + \binom{k}{2}} (5 + 3d)^k.$$

□

6 Conclusion and Future Work

One of the motivations to study critical points of Gaussian mixtures comes from the *mean shift algorithm*. It converges if there are only finitely many critical points. This was the main goal sought in [15] for Gaussian kernels. As our bound (12) only bounds the number of non-degenerate critical points of Gaussian mixtures, a final answer is still open. Non-degenerate critical points are isolated. Because the set of critical points of a Gaussian mixture is closed and bounded, it is finite if and only if it consists of isolated points (compare [8]).

Quantitatively, we do not expect our upper bound to be tight. Rather, proving the lower bound $\binom{d+k-1}{d}$ for all d, k will be the main focus of a forthcoming paper, extending the technique used to prove the case $d = 2$ presented here.

We observe that our lower bounds can be extended to all elliptical distributions, not only Gaussians. A study of the number of modes for mixtures of elliptical distributions, including t-distributions, is done in [1]. This is done by extending the concept of the ridgeline manifold to these distributions (upper bounds are 2 or 3 modes for a mixture of two t-distributions with equal dispersion matrices or same degrees of freedom).

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Bernd Sturmfels for bringing the problem to our attention and for his supportive comments. Thanks to Peter Green for pointing to the discussion thread in the `ANZstat` mailing list. Carlos Améndola was supported by the Einstein Foundation Berlin. Alexander Engström would like to thank Günter Ziegler and Freie Universität Berlin for their hospitality during his sabbatical.

References

[1] G. Alexandrovich, H. Holzmann and S. Ray: On the number of modes of finite mixtures of elliptical distributions. *Algorithms from and for Nature and Life*. Springer International Publishing 49-57 (2013).

[2] C. Améndola, M. Drton and B. Sturmfels: *Maximum likelihood estimates for Gaussian mixtures are transcendental*, Mathematical Aspects of Computer and Information Sciences 2015, Berlin, pp. 579-590 (2016).

[3] J. Behboodian: On the modes of a mixture of two normal distributions. *Technometrics* **12**, 131–139 (1970).

[4] P. Bürgisser, M. Clausen and A. Shokrollahi: Algebraic complexity theory (Vol. **315**). Springer Science & Business Media (2013).

[5] M. Carreira-Perpiñán and C. Williams: On the number of modes of a Gaussian mixture. Scale-Space Methods in Computer Vision. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **2695** 625–640 (2003).

[6] M. Carreira-Perpiñán and C. Williams: An isotropic Gaussian mixture can have more modes than components. Report EDI-INF-RR-0185, School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh, Scotland (2003).

[7] H. Edelsbrunner, B. Fasy and G. Rote: Add isotropic Gaussian mixtures at own risk: more and more resilient modes in higher dimensions. *Proc. of 27th Annual Symposium of Computational Geometry* (2012).

[8] Y.A. Ghassabeh: A sufficient condition for the convergence of the mean shift algorithm with Gaussian kernel. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **135** 1–10 (2015).

[9] C. Jin, Y, Zhang, S. Balakrishnan, M.J. Wainwright and M.I. Jordan: Local Maxima in the Likelihood of Gaussian Mixture Models: Structural Results and Algorithmic Consequences. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* pp. 4116-4124 (2016).

[10] A.G. Khovanskii: Fewnomials. *American Mathematical Society* Vol. **88** (1991).

[11] S. Ray and B. Lindsay: The topography of multivariate normal mixtures. *Annals of Statistics* **33** 2042–2065 (2005).

[12] S. Ray and D. Ren: On the upper bound of the number of modes of a multivariate normal mixture. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **108** 41–52 (2012).

[13] F. Sottile: Real solutions to equations from geometry (Vol. **57**). Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (2011).

[14] R. Steele, B. Sturmfels and S. Watanabe: Singular learning theory: connecting algebraic geometry and model selection in statistics. American Institute of Mathematics Workshop Summary, *http://aimath.org/pastworkshops/modelselectionrep.pdf* (2011)

[15] B. Wallace: On the critical points of Gaussian mixtures. *Master's Thesis* Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Queen's University (2003).